

REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 16-19 and 52-74 are pending in the application. Claims 52-55 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1-8 and 16-19 are allowed, subject to correction in accordance with the Interview conducted September 13, 2007.

Claims 56-71 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) based on Philipsson, of record in view of Labun, of record.

Claims 75 -77 have been added for further protection of the disclosed subject matter. Claim 75 has been amended to describe claim 1 in system format.

The drawings filed on March 19, 2004 are accepted by the Examiner.

I. Response to Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment

Claims 1 and 75 have been amended to include the limitations (1) “page scanning mode” ;(2) “by skipping the inquiry stage” and (3) “entering a page scanning mode”, pursuant to the Interview conducted September 13, 2007.

Entry of the amendments and withdrawal of the “Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment” are requested.

II. Response to Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 68-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 68-71 have been amended to define a computer readable storage medium including program code, executable in a computer system, for operation in accordance with the program code for short range radio communication with shortened session and user identification time in interactive service applications.

Applicants submit the subject matter of claims 68-71 defines a statutory category in the form of a process occurring as a result of executing the program code. Entry of the amendment and withdrawal of the rejection are requested.

III. Response to Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 56-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Philipsson (U.S. 2001/0007815) in view of Labun et al. (U.S. 6,842,621). Claims 56-67 include elements not disclosed or suggested in Philipsson in view of Labun and overcome the rejection under 35 USC 103(a), as follows:

1. Claim 56, as amended:

Claim 56 defines a notification signal received from an associated RF-ID communications module upon detecting an interrogation signal by the associated RF-ID communications module. The notification signal instructs an associated wireless short-range communication module to enter a shortened session set-up operation for detecting paging signals addressed to the associated wireless communication short-range communication module.

The Examiner acknowledges that Philipsson fails to disclose a notification signal and cites Labun as disclosing a notification signal indicating the presence of an interrogation signal.

Labun at column 9, lines 30-35 discloses an access point (AP1) that sends an instruction or notification to a mobile station to enter a page scan mode after a Bluetooth radio network control (BRNC) element has sent a message to the AP1 instructing the AP1 to disconnect from the mobile station, when the detected mobile station received signal strength indicator (RSSI) falls below a threshold. So, in other words, Labun at column 9, lines 30-35 discloses a mobile station handover system in a Bluetooth network, wherein the access point to which the mobile station is connected to sends a specific release message over the existing Bluetooth connection to instruct the mobile station to release the connection and enter into page scanning mode.

Labun fails to disclose or suggest (1) a notification signal indicating the presence of a RF-ID interrogation signal, (2) the notification signal provided within a mobile station in response to detection of the interrogation signal by an RF-ID communications module, wherein the notification signal is addressed to a short-range communication module of the mobile station and (3) the notification signal instructing the short-range communication module of the mobile station to enter into a shortened session set up operation mode for detecting paging signal.

The rejection of claim 56, as amended under 35 USC 103(a) is not supported in the cited art for the above reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 56 are requested.

2. Claim 62, as amended

The Examiner acknowledges that Philipsson fails to disclose a notification signal and cites Labun as disclosing a notification signal indicating the presence of an interrogation signal.

Labun discloses an access point (AP1) that sends an instruction or notification signal to a mobile station upon instruction by a Bluetooth radio network control (BRNC) element when the RSSI of the mobile station falls below a threshold as measured by the BRNC. Labun fails to disclose or suggest (1) a notification signal indicating the presence of a RF-ID interrogation signal (2) the notification signal provided within a mobile station in response to detection of the interrogation signal by a near field communication module, wherein the notification signal is addressed to a wireless short range communication module, and (3) the notification signal instructing the wireless short range communication module to enter into a predefined operation mode.

The rejection of claim 62, as amended under 35 USC 103(a) is not supported in the cited art for the above reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 62 are requested.

3. Claims 57 and 63

Claims 57 and 63 depend from and further limit claims 57 and 62, respectively and are patentable over Philipsson on the same basis as the claim from which they depend.

4. Claims 58 and 64

Applicant can find no disclosure in Paragraph 0016 of a serial number and clock offset information. The rejection of claims 58 and 64 is not supported in the cited art.

5. Claims 59 and 65

Claims 59 and 65 depend from and further limit claims 57 and 62, respectively and are patentable over Phillipson on the same basis as the claim from which they depend.

6. Claims 60 and 66

The Examiner cites Philipsson at Paragraph 0022 as describing the claimed subject matter. Paragraph 0022 describes a transponder or tag receiving an interrogation signal and not a paging signal, as recited in claims 60 and 66. The rejection of claims 60 and 66 is without support in the cited art.

7. Claim 61 and 67

The Examiner cites Philipsson at Paragraph 0025 as describing the claimed subject matter. Paragraph 0025 describes a respond signal includes a unique identification number of the pay terminal which is received by the sale terminal. The respond signal is separated and authenticated before a connection is established between the pay and sale terminals. There is no skipping of an inquiry stage by the sale terminal in Paragraph 0025. The rejection of claims 61 and 67 is without support in the cited art.

IV. Patentability Support for New Claims 75-77

New Claim 75 corresponds and describes claim 1 in apparatus format and is patentable on the same basis as claim 1

New Claims 76 and 77 depend from and further limit claim 56 and are patentable over the cited art on the same basis as claim 56

Entry of New claims 75-77 and allowance thereof are requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have distinguished pending claims 56-71 from the cited art, and supported the patentability of New Claim 75-77. Claims 1 and 75 have been amended to include inadvertently omitted elements. No new matter has been included in the response. Entry of the response, allowance of the claims and passage to issue of the subject application are requested.